

Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTO

INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT FILE NO.: GP03-03-008

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: General Plan Amendment to change the General Plan land use designation from Light Industrial with Mixed Industrial Overlay and Medium Density Residential (8-16 DU/AC) to Medium High Density Residential (12-25 DU/AC) on 9-acres, Neighborhood/Community Commercial on 5.2-acres and add Floating Park designation.

PROJECT LOCATION: Both sides of the 24th Street/McLaughlin Avenue and East William Street intersection.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Light Industrial with Mixed Industrial Overlay and Medium Density Residential (8-16 DU/AC). **ZONING:** LI Light Industrial District, R-1-8 Residence District.

SURROUNDING LAND USES: North: Residential; miscellaneous light industrial: **East:** mobile home park; single-family detached residential, two-family residential; miscellaneous neighborhood commercial and light industrial; **South**: Mobile home park; McKinley Neighborhood School, single-family detached residential and multi-family residential; **West**: Single-family detached residential, miscellaneous industrial. A Union Pacific railroad spur traverses through the center of the amendment site.

PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS: City of San Jose, c/o Bill Scott, 801 North First street, San Jose, CA 95115.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT(EIR) is required.
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, no further environmental analysis is required because all potentially significant effects have been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.
Date	Signature Name of Preparer: Bill Scott

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\boxtimes	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				\boxtimes	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				\boxtimes	1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				\boxtimes	1,2
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?			\boxtimes		1,2
for interface with a residential neighborhood. The project would industrial sites with new neighborhood serving commercial and n Maximum allowable building heights will be 50 feet as specified with the FWBT Plan. New development will meet current City d anticipated to significantly improve and enhance the residential a MITIGATION MEASURES: Project will conform to San Jose 20 City should apply strong architectural and site design controls on	nedium hi by San Jo lesign, lar nd visual	igh-density response 2020 Urbandscape and light character of the Design Police	sidential den Design pehting stande area. y #1 which	evelopn policy a dards a	nent. nd consiste nd is fies: "The
development of neighborhood character and for the proper transit II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project		fferent types of	fland uses	."	
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?					1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					1,3,4
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				\boxtimes	1,3,4
FINDINGS: <i>No adverse impacts</i> . The project would facilitate rearea in central San Jose. The project will not result in any impacts MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.				vithin a	n urbanized
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				\boxtimes	1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					1,14

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				1,14

FINDINGS: *No adverse impacts*. The project would result in the conversion of several industrial properties to pedestrian oriented commercial and medium high-density residential uses. The project site is surrounded by residential neighborhoods and therefore, the project would ultimately improve the overall residential living environment by facilitating the removal of non-compatible industrial uses and use of the hazardous materials associated with many types of light industrial operations.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		\boxtimes	1,10
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			1,6,10
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		\boxtimes	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		\boxtimes	1,2

FINDINGS: *No adverse impacts*. The project site is not in close proximity to any riparian habitat or any sensitive community identified in local or regional plans and will not conflict with the provisions of any habitat plan.

While the preservation of existing trees will be encouraged where possible, some ordinance size trees located on the subject site may have to be removed to accommodate new development.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The project is consistent with Urban Forest policy #2, which specifies: "Development projects should include the preservation of ordinance-size and significant trees. When tree preservation is not feasible, the project should include appropriate tree replacement." Prior to future development a Tree Survey shall be required. Any adverse affect on the health and longevity of native oaks, ordinance size or other significant trees should be avoided and any ordinance size trees identified for removal shall be replaced in accordance with City standards.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				\boxtimes	1,7
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?					1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?					1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					1,8
FINDINGS: <i>No adverse impacts</i> . The project site is <i>not</i> located and will not have an adverse impact on known historical or cultu MITIGATION MEASURES: None required. V. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:			archaeol	ogical s	sensitivity
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)					1,5,24
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?					1,5,24
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		\boxtimes			1,5,24
4) Landslides?					1,5,24
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				\boxtimes	1,5,24
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?					1,5,24
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			\boxtimes		1,5,24
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				\boxtimes	1,5,24

FINDINGS: *No significant adverse impact with mitigation*. As is typical for the entire Santa Clara Valley area the project site is located within an area of geological sensitivity.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The project will conform to Soils and Geologic Condition Policy #6, which specifies: "Development in areas subject to soils and geologic hazards should incorporate adequate mitigation measures." At the development stage potential problems will be mitigated with standard engineering techniques.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would	the pro	ject:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				\boxtimes	1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				\boxtimes	1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\boxtimes	1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?					1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes	1,2
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes	1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes	1,2
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				\boxtimes	1

FINDINGS: *No significant adverse impact*. Since many of the subject parcels have historically contained light industrial uses there is a potential for soil contamination on these sites. Sites would be analyzed at the Development Review Stage.

Two of the subject parcels are listed on the State of California "Hazardous Waste and Substances" list (1998). Three hundred 24th Street (Assessor's Parcel Number 472-04-014) is proposed for future neighborhood commercial use. Letters dated October 2, 2002 from Kendall Price C2C Environmental Engineering Contractors, and from Benjamin Berman, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Oversight Program, dated September 2, 2002, indicate that the site has been cleaned up to State standards.

Another listed site, 226 24th Street (Assessors Parcel Number 472-05-024). Is proposed for future high density residential and/or mixed-use. Correspondence from Gary Lynch, City of San Jose Office of Environmental Services dated April 7, 2003, has indicated that it is most efficient to prepare site-specific analysis of this and all of the subject properties used for industrial purposes at the project stage. Project will conform to Soils and Geologic Condition Policy #9 which specifies: "Residential development proposed on property formerly used for agricultural or heavy industrial uses should incorporate adequate mitigation/remediation for soils contamination as recommended through the Development Review process."

MITIGATION MEASURES: At the project development review stage all properties will be evaluated to determine if past use will require cleanup (mitigation). Property specific analysis will be conduced at the project stage and the project will be required to clean up the site prior to construction in compliance with state regulations. Soils and Geologic Condition Policy #9: Development proposed on property formerly used for agriculture or heavy industrial uses should incorporate adequate mitigation remediation for soils contamination as recommended through the development review process. At the project development stage all properties will be evaluated to determine if past use will require cleanup. Property specific analysis will

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

be conducted at the project stage and the project will be required to clean up the site prior to construction in compliance with state regulations.

VI. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the	he proje	ct:		
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge	П		\boxtimes	1,15
requirements?				, -
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses				1
for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?			\boxtimes	1
d) Result in increased erosion in its watershed?				1
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?			\boxtimes	1
f) Substantially alter drainage patterns due to changes in runoff volumes and flow rates?			\boxtimes	
g) Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff as specified in the NPDES permit and the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy?				
h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				1,17
i) Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters such as heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash?				1,17
j) Result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303 (d) list available from the State Water Control Board?				
k) Result in alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction including clarity, temperature, and level of pollutants?			\boxtimes	
Substantially alter surface water quality, or marine, fresh, or wetland waters as specified in the NPDES permit?				
m) Substantially alter ground water quality as specified in the NPDES permit?			\boxtimes	
n) Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses as specified in the NPDES Permit, General Plan, and City policy?			\boxtimes	
o) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				1
p) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				1,9
q) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			\boxtimes	1,9

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
r) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				1
s) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			\boxtimes	1

FINDINGS: *No significant adverse impact*. As indicated above the subject site is already developed. Much of the site is developed with light industrial uses constructed prior to modern environmental standards. Outdoor storage facilities on unpaved surfaces and operations that routinely use hazardous materials are typical in the project area. This amendment would facilitate replacement of these substandard industrial uses with residential, commercial and mixed-use development that would be constructed to modern environmental and Post Construction Urban Runoff water quality standards. The proposed project could be anticipated to ultimately improve storm water and water quality conditions. The project will conform to the City of San Jose's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to reduce impacts on storm water quality from construction and post construction activities.

VII. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?			1,2
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?		\boxtimes	1,2

FINDINGS: Loss of industrial land, no significant adverse impacts. The proposed General Plan amendment would facilitate the future conversion of approximately 14-acres of land currently designated for and occupied by light industrial uses to residential, commercial and open space uses.

The industrial land use policies of the San Jose 2020 General Plan recognize that there is a finite supply of industrial land in the City to meet the City's Economic Development Goals. The General Plan makes a distinction between prime industrial lands planned exclusively for industrial development and non-prime industrial areas.

The General Plan also recognizes that many of the older industrial sites near the Downtown Core are underutilized and their redevelopment is generally encouraged. The majority of the subject site is small cluster of older industrial uses. The site is surrounded by the residential neighborhoods that make up the *Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace* neighborhood revitalization strategy area. The recent abandonment of the Union pacific Railroad spur has further isolated these industrial operations from other major industrial suppliers and services. In 1995 the Mixed Industrial Overlay was applied to the subject site to indicate that the area has been determined to consist of non-prime industrial land, suitable for other uses. Conversion of these marginal and in some cases blighted industrial uses to pedestrian oriented residential and neighborhood serving commercial uses would support the overall revitalization efforts as established by the *Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace Neighborhood Improvement Plan*.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The proposed project is consistent with Urban Conservation policy #2 which specifies: "the City should encourage new development, which enhances the desirable qualities of the community and existing neighborhoods."

Residential land use policy #2 Specifies: "Residential neighborhoods should be protected from encroachment of incompatible activities or land uses which may have negative effect on the living environment."

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
Commercial land Use policy #4 specifies: 'The City should revitalization of existing commercial areas and centers."	encouraș	ge upgrading,	beautify	ing and	l
Neighborhood Identity policy #3 which specifies: "Public as improve the character of existing neighborhoods. Factors the should be removed." VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes	1,2,23
FINDINGS: Redevelopment of the project site will not result in MITIGATION MEASURES: None required. IX. NOISE - Would the project result in:	adverse ii	mpacts to mine	eral resour	ces.	
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			\boxtimes		1,2,13,18
b)Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					1
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					1
d)A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes		1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes	1
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes	1
FINDINGS: <i>No significant adverse impact</i> . The proposed incompatible industrial uses. During construction, there will					f
MITIGATION MEASURES: The project will conform the those of State Title 24 that pertain to multi-family units. State equipment mufflers will be utilized during the term of the praceptable level.	andard co	onstruction te	chniques,	includ	ling
X. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project	t:	Г		1	
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					1,2
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					1
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					1

File No. GP03-03-008 INITIAL STUDY			P	age No.	9
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts. The proposed projoriented residential uses on an underutilized infill site consistent Jose 2020 General Plan and the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrac MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.	with the C				
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:					,
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire Protection?				\boxtimes	1,2
Police Protection?				\boxtimes	1,2
Schools?				\boxtimes	1,2
Parks?					1,2
					1,2
approximately 162 residential units and a net loss of approximate amendment would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized i revitalization existing facilities in the 24 th /William Street vicinity plan. A TRANPLAN model run for this and other General Plan	ely 358 job nfill site a as specif amendme	os. As previous nd is anticipated by the Five nts indicates the	ously discued to encore Wounds/I nat long-ten	nt would ssed, the urage u Brookv rm traf	d result in ne proposed apgrade and vood Terrad
FINDINGS: <i>No significant impacts</i> . Based on General Plan met approximately 162 residential units and a net loss of approximate amendment would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized i revitalization existing facilities in the 24 th /William Street vicinity plan. A TRANPLAN model run for this and other General Plan is available to serve the amendment. Adequate municipal service MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required	ely 358 job nfill site a as specif amendme	os. As previous nd is anticipated by the Five nts indicates the	ously discued to encore Wounds/I nat long-ten	nt would ssed, the urage u Brookv rm traf	d result in ne proposed apgrade and vood Terrad
FINDINGS: <i>No significant impacts</i> . Based on General Plan met approximately 162 residential units and a net loss of approximate amendment would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized i revitalization existing facilities in the 24 th /William Street vicinity plan. A TRANPLAN model run for this and other General Plan is available to serve the amendment. Adequate municipal service MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required RECREATION	ely 358 job nfill site a as specif amendme	os. As previous nd is anticipated by the Five nts indicates the	ously discued to encore Wounds/I nat long-ten	nt would ssed, the urage u Brookv rm traf	d result in ne proposed apgrade and vood Terrad
FINDINGS: <i>No significant impacts</i> . Based on General Plan met approximately 162 residential units and a net loss of approximate amendment would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized i revitalization existing facilities in the 24 th /William Street vicinity plan. A TRANPLAN model run for this and other General Plan is available to serve the amendment. Adequate municipal service MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required RECREATION a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	ely 358 job nfill site a as specif amendme	os. As previous nd is anticipated by the Five nts indicates the	ously discued to encore Wounds/I nat long-ten	nt would ssed, the urage u Brookv rm traf	d result in ne proposed apgrade and vood Terrad
FINDINGS: <i>No significant impacts</i> . Based on General Plan met approximately 162 residential units and a net loss of approximate amendment would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized i revitalization existing facilities in the 24 th /William Street vicinity plan. A TRANPLAN model run for this and other General Plan is available to serve the amendment. Adequate municipal service MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required RECREATION a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial	ely 358 jol nfill site a as specif amendme es are avai	os. As previous nd is anticipated by the Five nts indicates the ilable to serve	ously discused to encouse Wounds/Inat long-tenthe project	at would ssed, th urage u Brookv rm traf	d result in ne proposed apgrade and vood Terrac fic capacity
FINDINGS: No significant impacts. Based on General Plan met approximately 162 residential units and a net loss of approximate amendment would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized i revitalization existing facilities in the 24 th /William Street vicinity plan. A TRANPLAN model run for this and other General Plan is available to serve the amendment. Adequate municipal service MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required RECREATION a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts. The project would anticipated to increase the use of park facilities in the area. The nanticipated to be substantial. The project would contribute to fut Parkland Dedication Ordinance. MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:	ely 358 jol nfill site a as specifiamendme es are avairable.	os. As previous nd is anticipated by the Five nts indicates the ilable to serve to the ilab	pusly discured to encore Wounds/I hat long-tenthe project	at would ssed, the urage use Brooky rm trafficities.	d result in the proposed apprade and wood Terrac fic capacity 1,2 1,2 uld be is not
FINDINGS: No significant impacts. Based on General Plan met approximately 162 residential units and a net loss of approximate amendment would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized i revitalization existing facilities in the 24 th /William Street vicinity plan. A TRANPLAN model run for this and other General Plan is available to serve the amendment. Adequate municipal service MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required RECREATION a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts. The project would anticipated to increase the use of park facilities in the area. The naticipated to be substantial. The project would contribute to fut Parkland Dedication Ordinance. MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required	ely 358 jol nfill site a as specifiamendme es are avairable.	os. As previous nd is anticipated by the Five nts indicates the ilable to serve to the ilab	pusly discured to encore Wounds/I hat long-tenthe project	at would ssed, the urage use Brooky rm trafficities.	d result in the proposed apprade and wood Terrac fic capacity 1,2 1,2 uld be is not

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			\boxtimes	1,19
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\boxtimes	1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			\boxtimes	1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				1,18
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			\boxtimes	1,2,18

FINDINGS: *No significant adverse impacts*. As indicated above, a TRANPLAN transportation model has concluded that adequate long-term capacity is available to serve the projects. Short-term traffic impacts would be analyzed and mitigation identified as necessary at the development review stage.

Long-term traffic capacity is available to serve the project, short term-traffic impacts will be analyzed at the development review stage and future development will conform to the City's Transportation Level of Service Policy. The project will conform to the City's Design Guidelines and Zoning Ordinance to ensure adequate parking and circulation is provided.

MITIGATION MEASURES: Future development will conform to the City's General Plan Transportation Level of Service (LOS) Policy.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			1,15
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			1,2,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		\boxtimes	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		\boxtimes	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		\boxtimes	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		\boxtimes	1,21

FINDINGS: No significant adverse impacts. Adequate municipal services are available to serve the project.

MITIGATION MEASURES: MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Noniticant With	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?					1,10
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.					1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?					1

FINDINGS: The project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

- 1. <u>Urban Design Policy #1</u>: The City should continue to apply strong architectural and site design controls on all types of development for the protection and development of neighborhood character.
- 2. <u>Urban Forest policy #2</u>: Development projects should include the preservation of ordinance-size and significant trees. When tree preservation is not feasible, the project should include appropriate tree replacement. Prior to future development a Tree Survey shall be required. Any adverse affect on the health and longevity of native oaks, ordinance size or other significant trees should be avoided and any ordinance size trees identified for removal shall be replaced in accordance with City standards.
- 3. <u>Soils and Geologic Condition policy No. 6:</u> Development in areas subject to soils and geologic hazards should incorporate adequate mitigation measures.
- 4. <u>Soils and Geologic Condition Policy #9</u>: Development proposed on property formerly used for agriculture or heavy industrial uses should incorporate adequate mitigation remediation for soils contamination as recommended through the development review process. At the project development stage all properties will be evaluated to determine if past use will require cleanup. Property specific analysis will be conducted at the project stage and the project will be required to clean up the site prior to construction in compliance with state regulations.
- 5. <u>Urban Conservation policy #2</u>: The City should encourage new development, which enhances the desirable qualities of the community and existing neighborhoods.
- 6. <u>Residential land use policy #2</u>: Residential neighborhoods should be protected from encroachment of incompatible activities or land uses which may have negative effect on the living environment.
- 7. <u>Commercial land Use policy #4</u>: The City should encourage upgrading, beautifying and revitalization of existing commercial areas and centers.
- 8. <u>Neighborhood identity Policy #3:</u> Public and private development should be designed to improve the character of existing neighborhoods.
- 9. Future development will conform to the City's General Plan Transportation Level of Service (LOS) Policy.
- 10. The project will conform to the City's General Plan noise guidelines.

Issues	Potentially Significant With Significant Mitigation Incorporated Impact Incorporated Impact I
--------	--

CHECKLIST REFERENCES

- 1. Environmental Clearance Application File No. GP03-03-008
- 2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
- 3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
- 4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
- 5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
- 6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
- San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
- 8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
- 9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
- 10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
- 11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
- 12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
- 13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
- 14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
- 15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
- 16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
- 17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
- 18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
- 19. San Jose Department of Public Works
- 20. San Jose Fire Department
- 21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
- 22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
- 23. California Division of Mines and Geology
- 24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974